1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
2	WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON	
3	AT TACOMA	
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11		Docket No. CR02-6067FDB Tacoma, Washington June 13, 2003
12 13 14 15	BEFORE THE HONORABLE FRANKLIN D. BURGESS UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE. APPEARANCES:	
16 17	As 70	NET FREEMAN sistant United States Attorney O Stewart Street, Suite 5220 eattle, Washington 98101-1271
18 19 20	Of 13	OLIN FIEMAN Fice of the Public Defender 131 Broadway, Suite 400 Icoma, Washington 98402
21	Probation Department: DC	NALD MOON
22 23	Ur 17 Ta	eri Hendrix nion Station Courthouse, Rm 3100 17 Pacific Avenue ncoma, Washington 98402 153) 593-6545
2425	Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography, transcript produced by Reporter on computer.	

1 FRIDAY, JUNE 13, 2003 - 9:00 A.M. 2 CR02-6067, United States of America 3 THE CLERK: versus Micah J. Gourde. 4 5 Counsel, please make your appearances for the record. 6 MS. FREEMAN: Good morning, Your Honor. Janet 7 Freeman on behalf of the United States. 8 MR. FIEMAN: Good morning, Your Honor. Colin Fieman 9 for Mr. Gourde. 10 THE COURT: All right. This matter is on today for 11 sentencing. What I have received in this regard is the 12 presentence report, the government's sentencing memorandum, 13 and the defendant's sentencing memorandum, along with a motion 14 as to this defendant being released pending the appeal matter. 15 I received this morning a letter that evidently didn't 16 make it into the presentence report, from a Shelley Anderson, 17 and it refers to Mr. Gourde. I believe, Mr. Fieman, as to the 18 presentence report, there was an updated or revised sentencing 19 recommendation from the probation department. 20 documents that I have mentioned, everybody has received a copy 21 of them and all of that? 22 MR. FIEMAN: Yes, Your Honor. I would just note for 23 the record that in terms of the revised sentencing

recommendation, there was a typographical error that I

confirmed with Mr. Moon. It does say custody recommendation

24

25

```
is 21 months. Then in the paragraph where it states
 1
 2
    respectfully recommend the sentence be imposed as follows, it
    says that the defendant should be committed to the custody of
    the BOP for a term of 30 months. I believe the 30 months, of
 4
    course, was simply a typographical error, and the
 5
 6
    recommendation is 21 months.
 7
             THE COURT: It would appear, Mr. Moon, do you agree
8
    with that?
9
             PROBATION OFFICER: Yes, Your Honor.
10
             THE COURT:
                         It is a change from the revised --
11
             MR. FIEMAN: Correct, Your Honor.
             THE COURT: So that should read 20 months.
12
13
        All right, anything else? What about the presentence
14
    report itself, anything from a factual standpoint that needs
15
    correcting in that regard?
16
             MR. FIEMAN:
                          No, Your Honor.
                                     Then I believe that we are
17
             THE COURT:
                         All right.
18
    ready for sentencing?
19
                          Ready to proceed, Your Honor.
             MR. FLEMAN:
20
             THE COURT:
                         All right. Ms. Freeman, I will start
21
    with you.
22
             MS. FREEMAN:
                           Before we begin, Your Honor, I think I
23
    heard you say you had a letter from Shelley Anderson.
24
             THE COURT: You didn't receive a copy of it?
25
             MR. FIEMAN: I am sorry, this was one that was in Don
```

```
Moon's file which he brought directly over. It is from his
 1
 2
         You certainly should see a copy of it. I don't have a
    copy of it either. It went directly to probation. I did ask
 4
    Mr. Moon to provide a copy directly to you.
 5
             THE COURT: Would you like to see a copy? It is from
6
    his aunt speaking on his behalf as to his character and that
7
    kind of thing, so if you'd like to make copies of it, we can
8
    do that and you can each have a copy. It is the basic letter
9
    saying nice things about Mr. Gourde.
10
             MS. FREEMAN:
                         I think simply to keep my record
11
    complete, I would like a copy of that.
12
             THE COURT: Mr. Fieman, do you have a copy? I don't
13
    ei ther.
14
        Why don't you make a couple copies so you can each have
15
    that.
16
        Do you want me to proceed while we are waiting on the
    letter?
17
18
             MS. FREEMAN: I think we can go ahead and proceed.
19
    If I need to add something in addition after receiving the
20
    letter --
21
             THE COURT:
                                Go ahead.
                         Okay.
22
             MS. FREEMAN: Your Honor, I do concur with the
23
    recommendation of the pretrial -- excuse me, with the
24
    probation office. I have recommended the low end of the
```

range, or I should say the revised range once the acceptance

25

of responsibility adjustment was made. That low end of the range is 21 months in this particular case.

I do not agree with the downward departure and with the position that has been taken by Mr. Gourde in the sentencing memorandum provided by his attorney. There appeared to be several bases upon which he is making a motion for downward departure, and I would like to address each of those in turn.

THE COURT: All right.

MS. FREEMAN: With respect to the first claim that his offense conduct falls outside the heartland, Mr. Gourde's attorney relies on the case of <u>United States v. Parish</u>. As I understand, this was a case that was submitted by the Ninth Circuit in 2002, as I recall. In the event the Court does not know, the government did petition for a rehearing en banc in that case, and my understanding is that was denied.

Sp in any event, I looked to the <u>Parish</u> case, however, and I can distinguish that case factually from our case here. I point out that the District Judge in the <u>Parish</u> case seemed to rely on two bases upon which to make a downward departure.

One was the claim that the conduct was outside the heartland, which I will address in a moment.

The second basis was based upon a belief that that particular offender would be susceptible to abuse based on his physical characteristics. Then the Ninth Circuit went on to talk about the physical characteristics of the defendant in

that case and attempted to understand what it was that had concerned the District Court so much, and further concluding that the District Court was in the best position to observe the demeanor of a particular defendant as well as the physical characteristics.

So the record is not fully complete in the <u>Parish</u> case, as far as I can tell, based on what that demeanor might have been or what it was, but it appeared to be of grave concern to the District Judge in that case.

We are not hearing that here. I don't see anything about this particular case, about the physical characteristics or about the demeanor of the defendant in this case which seems to fit within the confines of the concerns of the District Judge in Montana or the Ninth Circuit for that matter.

I think that's important because the Ninth Circuit placed much reliance on the susceptibility to abuse, as apparently did the District Court, and we just don't have that issue here, Your Honor.

Furthermore, in the <u>Parish</u> case there was no evidence presented that the defendant had actively downloaded or stored any images of child pornography. There was also evidence presented that there had been no storing of information or filing of pornographic images in certain manners and means and that type of thing.

Well, here, we do have evidence that there was an active

download of images in this particular case. As the Court might recall, we had a lengthy suppression hearing in which the FBI agents testified, and it was brought out at that time that the defendant became a subscriber to a web site which did offer child pornographic images. As I recall, the introductory page to the web site offered nude images of girls ranging between the ages of 12 and 17.

So unlike the <u>Parish</u> case, or at least unlike evidence that was presented or not presented in that case, the defendant here did actively download images, and there were approximately 100 or so such images in the allocated space which, as I understand, indicates an active download on a computer system.

Under the allocated space, which seems to be akin to the <u>Parish</u> matter, which referred to the temporary Internet access files, in Mr. Gourde's case there were hundreds, hundreds of images, which included full scale images as well as thumbnail images.

Unlike <u>Parish</u>, the defendant paid to get the images here by joining this web site which required a monthly access fee. The evidence presented shows he began the membership in or around November 2001 and continued through on or about January 21, 2002, when the web site was taken down by a federal search warrant in lowa.

Furthermore, in the Parish case, there was expert

testimony presented by a doctor or psychologist of some kind who testified for the sentencing court. Based on that expert testimony, the doctor opined that that particular defendant did not fall within the heartland of the child pornography type possession cases, and that he did not fall within the heartland based on the doctor's work with other sexual type offenders that were in the federal prison area in that part of Montana.

Here, we don't have any such testimony, and it is not being presented. It also plays into the <u>Stevens</u> case, which was cited by Mr. Fieman in his brief, and the <u>Parish</u> court also made reference to the <u>Stevens</u> case. As this Court may know, the Ninth Circuit did not affirm a downward departure in the <u>Stevens</u> case. Instead, the Ninth Circuit found that the downward departure had been made for impermissible reasons and made clear that there needed to be some kind of a comparison. In order to find whether a case is outside the heartland of a particular case, the sentencing court needs to make a determination that the offense conduct falls outside the heartland.

In the <u>Stevens</u> case, there was no such evidence or information that was presented to the District Court, and therefore that was one of the bases upon which the District Court improperly granted a downward departure in <u>Stevens</u>.

So for those reasons, I think the <u>Parish</u> case can be

distinguished from this case at hand.

I would like to follow through with the <u>Stevens</u> case as well, because I think it is instructive on downward departures. The Ninth Circuit spent most of that opinion giving the guidance to the District Court on what the District Court may or may not rely upon when viewing this decision of heartland and whether or not a certain offense conduct falls outside the heartland.

Again, I point out that the Ninth Circuit made clear that there needs to be a comparison with the other offenders that are similarly situated.

I don't know how many cases that have been put before this Court. I am sort of new to this area of child pornography myself, although I have been a prosecutor for many years, but it seems that many of the cases that I am now working on and participating in the investigations and preparing for charging documents, they seem to involve the same kind of conduct based on my experience.

In other words, we are seeing a lot of computer usage with respect to the Internet, with respect to downloading and pursuing these web sites in which the access to these child pornographic images are gained.

So based on my experience, I don't really see anything about this case that's taking it outside of these other offenders that I am prosecuting. In fact, this offender seems

to be similarly situated to the other ones.

There was another point I wanted to make about the <u>Stevens</u> case, and as I keep talking it will probably come to me. But in any event, I will move along to the other bases presented in the defense sentencing recommendation.

I do oppose a downward departure based on aberrant behavior. This was not a one-time deal. Again, we had at least 100 images in the allocated space. We had hundreds of images in the unallocated space. We know this defendant was a subscriber to this particular web site for a two-month period.

Again, I remind the Court that this was a paid subscription which was automatically renewed each month, and a person continues to be a member to that web site unless they took active steps to remove themselves, and there was no evidence of that here.

Based on the number of images, based on the fact that he actively downloaded images, based on the fact that he did pay a subscription for these images, I don't think that fits into the description of aberrant behavior because there was continued use by the facts and circumstances that I have presented to the Court.

On the question of post-offense rehabilitation, I oppose that request as well. From what I have seen in the sentencing recommendation, it appears that Mr. Gourde is participating in some kind of counseling, dealing with perhaps some alcohol

related issues. But when I think of the post-offense rehabilitation, I think of rehabilitating from the offense conduct in question, and the offense conduct in question seems to indicate some kind of sexual related issues.

I am not an expert, and I am not trying to pretend to be one, Your Honor, but there again seems to be some kind of issues, and I don't hear that the defendant has been participating with any counseling in relation to sexual deviancy issues or some type of sexual treatment or things along those lines. I am not seeing that kind of supposedly post-offense rehabilitation going on.

As I said, when I think of a post-offense rehabilitation, I think more along the lines of what is being rehabilitated from the particular offense conduct in question. That again, just does not seem present in this particular case.

All things considered, I believe that the recommendation by the government and the probation office is fair. As I pointed out in my sentencing memorandum, we did locate some images of what appeared to be four to five to six-year old kids, and the guidelines seem to indicate that there is an enhancement that can be applicable for minors under the age of 12. I am not pursuing that. I am going to err in favor of the defendant and give him the benefit of the doubt. But I make the Court aware of this information so that the Court is wholly aware of the entire conduct in this particular case.

Furthermore, there has just been -- the evidence that has been presented to the Court has been evidenced by way of the suppression hearing, by way of the findings of the presentence report and information that has been passed along in the sentencing memoranda.

What I am saying is that the Court just doesn't have evidence really one way or another about what, if anything, in particular Mr. Gourde might have done with the images and the unallocated space of his computer, because once there was a guilty plea in the case there was no need for either party to pursue computer forensics any further.

So I am anticipating that my colleague, Mr. Fieman, of whom I have tremendous respect, will proffer some kind of argument to the Court that there was no evidence that Mr. Gourde was communicating with other minors or that there was no particular organization or filing of certain images.

All I am suggesting to the Court is that we really don't have evidence just one way or the other that's clearly set forth on this point. But what we do have evidence of, as presented at the suppression hearing, is that there were images that were actively downloaded by Mr. Gourde.

Furthermore, the point came to me with respect to the Stevens case. The Stevens case seemed to think that because a computer was involved in that case, that provided for an enhancement under the sentencing guidelines.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

24

25

The Stevens court seemed to indicate that that enhancement in and of itself seemed to weigh against issuing a downward departure just by virtue of the fact that the Sentencing Commission believed that some kind of enhancement was warranted by the use of a computer in a particular case, and I wanted to point that out as well to the Court. Unless there are further questions by the Court or any questions by the Court, I am finished with my allocution. However, I also wish to point out that pursuant to the terms of the plea agreement, the parties have agreed to a criminal forfeiture. I have prepared today a preliminary order of forfeiture, and that forfeiture pertains to the Western Digital hard drive, which was part of the computer in this case, as well as the pornographic magazines and the visual images of minor children engaged in sexually explicit conduct. I have shared this preliminary order with Mr. Fieman, and my understanding is that he has no objection to it. Thus, when we get to that part of the proceedings, I wish to present this preliminary order to the Court. THE COURT: All right. MS. FREEMAN: Thank you. THE COURT: Mr. Fieman.

THE COURT: Mr. Fieman.

MR. FIEMAN: Thank you, Judge.

Judge, if I may address you from here, it is just a little crowded.

Your Honor, the law that the Court can rely on for departure is set out in the memo. Clearly, it is a matter entirely for your discretion. I don't think it's a question whether the law allows for departure but whether Micah deserves one. I think there are some remarkable aspects to Mr. Gourde and the way he has handled his case.

I do want to note, however, and I think it is important that the record reflect that we do not agree, and that there is based on the suppression hearing and the statement of facts, there is no evidence that there was active downloading in this case.

Indeed, the whole premise of the suppression hearing, as Your Honor very well recalls, was the idea that somebody could visit a web site, have images transmitted to temporary caches or end up being in what's called unallocated space and be charged with possession.

Whatever the ruling was, the facts and the whole issue is that there was no evidence that Mr. Gourde had actively downloaded or stored or otherwise put in the type of intentional behavior that is normally seen in these cases.

So I need to note that for the record because we very much objected to that characterization, and of course the statement of facts in the plea agreement does not contain any concession as to active downloading.

Leaving that aside though, what we are really here to

determine is whether or not, I believe, Your Honor, Mr. Gourde merits a downward departure. I have laid out, I think, a number of compelling reasons why I think Micah is an exception.

Frankly, Your Honor, and I don't say this easily, I have not stood before the Court in any jurisdiction with a client and been able to say to the Court that I have seen a young man take responsibility and takes measures to turn his life around to the extent that Micah has. I, frankly, as an attorney find it remarkable.

Before I met Micah, before we discussed the charges against him, before he ever appeared in court, he took the opportunity that these charges presented to do one of two things. He could either seek to evade responsibility, go backwards, refuse to accept what the reality of this situation was, or he could use it as an opportunity for change.

He has been out for over a year now, since the search warrant was executed. Frankly, it is amazing to me, and I think Micah is in better shape and a much better human being as a result of going through this process.

Now, I often would come to the Court and say well, I hope that's the result of my client, or I have seen signs of change, or believing that a client was a good prospect for rehabilitation. I have not stood before the Court and had a client where I feel they have already demonstrated a

remarkable change in their life to the extent that Micah has.

He stopped drinking on his own, cold turkey, after this search warrant was executed. That is a difficult thing for anybody to do. It is difficult, particularly under stressful circumstances. And for him to realize that he needs to start reforming and getting control of his life to that extent, based on the shock of having his computer seized and facing criminal charges, I think says a great deal about him.

He, without consulting with any attorneys, without coming to the Court or realizing the consequences, he went out the following month after the search warrant was executed, found his own counselor, has been paying for counseling on a regular basis out of his own employment which he has maintained since the age of 18 without a break, and that counseling is extensive.

It is not directly alcohol related at all. In fact, it deals with every issue in Micah's life, including any issues regarding controlling his behavior and using a computer, any sexual issue he may have. This is comprehensive psychotherapeutic counseling. He started himself on that, and he's maintained it for a year. And there is, of course, a letter to the Court that says he has made good to excellent progress in that regard.

This is not a situation where I am coming to the Court and saying well, Your Honor, I have a client that deserves a break

```
because he's amenable to treatment, and possibly we substitute
 1
 2
    treatment for part of a jail sentence we'll see some progress.
    This is somebody who has used the last 12 months to make that
 4
    progress on his own. That, frankly, to me is truly
 5
    excepti onal.
 6
        There is one additional letter which I just received that
 7
    I would ask to submit to the Court. A copy has been provided
8
    to Ms. Freeman. It is from Micah's employer, David Kernitch.
9
    I have a copy to submit to the Court. I would just like to
10
    read one part of this.
11
        Mr. Kernitch has known Micah since the late 1980s when
12
    Micah was in high school with Mr. Kernitch's older daughter.
13
    Mr. Kernitch is a manager of the west region for
14
    Offshore-Inland, which is a national company based in Mobile.
15
        Micah has worked there since the age of 18 full-time,
16
    frequently with extensive overtime, or its predecessor
17
    company.
18
        This is just part of what Mr. Kernitch had to say.
                                                             Не
19
    describes Micah as a person with a very high level of
20
    maturity, honesty, self-being and morality.
21
        He goes on to say: As I get older, I don't see these
22
    qualities being demonstrated by people of this age and in some
    cases people older than he is. I have quite a high regard for
23
24
    this young man and consider Micah a very good friend.
25
        When my wife and I go on vacation and leave town, Micah
```

lives at the house making sure our dogs and house are taken care of until we return. No matter what I might need, I know if I call Micah for help he will be there for me. This is the type of integrity that he has used. I would trust Micah with anything I have.

Then it closes with what I think is another truly remarkable statement. Mr. Kernitch says that I was blessed with two wonderful daughters, but if I would have had had a son, I can only hope he would be like Micah Gourde.

Now, Mr. Kernitch deals in a rough and tumble industry maintaining offshore equipment. He has seen a full array of characters and certainly is not a man to take lightly the statement of character like this.

He's also fully aware of the charges that Micah is facing. He's been very supportive of that. He knows he's in court today. He knows what he is facing. He knows why he is here, and he submitted this letter yesterday on behalf of Micah.

I think for somebody to do something like that when somebody is facing these type of charges, knowing what they are facing, it is certainly a stronger testament than I can make, even knowing Micah for the short period I have.

If I may hand this up to the Court for the full record.

So, Your Honor, I think Micah would like the opportunity to address the Court himself, and I think he can say anything for himself much better than I can.

I would note that Micah's parents have been here. They have been remarkably supportive through this, and I think he considers himself blessed to have the parents he does and the family support he has. I think that's gone a long way over the past year to get him to the point where he is today.

Oddly enough, Your Honor, whatever your sentence is, I think Micah sees this as a positive turning point in his life. He's accepted responsibility. He is going to accept, of course, whatever sentence you impose. I don't think, in some respects, the sentence is truly significant.

I think the fact that he has got to this point today, to the extent of beating his alcoholism and taking responsibility for his life and having a future to look forward to, I think is going to be very, very positive, makes him a strong and worthy individual. And I am proud to represent him in this case.

So, Your Honor, Mr. Gourde can address the Court. I have nothing further to say.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Gourde.

THE DEFENDANT: Good morning, Your Honor. My name is Micah Gourde. I am 26 years old. I grew up with a very loving and supportive family in Castle Rock, Washington. I have got an excellent relationship with them. They have stood by me, beside me through all this. And I can't ask for anything more than that from them or anybody else.

I have got a lot of very, very close friends. You heard from one of them, my boss, who wrote you that letter. I grew up with his daughter and am very fortunate to know all of them.

I would like to start this actually by saying that I am sorry that I have allowed myself to get into this position. I fought with alcohol for quite a few years. And I fell into, I don't want to call it a trap, I don't know what I could call it. I simply digressed into turning into a person that I no longer knew anymore.

I have got no reasonable explanation for my behavior. All I can do is say I am sorry and I intend for it to never happen again. I stopped drinking. I intend to never drink again.

Colin hit the nail on the head when he says he thinks I see it as a turning point, and I do actually see it as a turning point. Whatever sentence is imposed on me is simply a means to an end.

I am a better person today than I was a year ago, or two or three or five years ago.

Five years from now, I am going to be an even better person because this entire thing is going to be behind me. I have learned a lot from it. I have learned a lot about myself. I have learned a lot about my family. I have learned a lot about my friends. I have learned a lot about life in general.

I am at a point in my life that I've seen people 40, 50, 60 years old not reach yet. I have known alcoholics that have gone on to their mid 40s and mid 50s and wind up losing their jobs, losing their families, losing their health, losing their cars, and they get to a point where they can never recover.

I was actually fortunate that I had the surprise of the FBI knocking on the door and jolted me into realizing that I had a serious problem that I needed to take care of.

The only time to take care of a problem like this is the present. So I handled it in the best way I could, and that was to simply stop drinking, which was probably one of the hardest things in my life to do, right up next to telling my parents that the allegations were true and sitting down and actually talking with them and letting them know that I actually had created the trouble, the very serious trouble that I was and currently am in.

I had a lot of stuff written down that I wanted to cover, but I guess I can pretty much sum it up by saying that I have always been a good person. I fell into a position in my life that I never, never could have conceived of being in. Now that I am beyond that, I am going to continue being a good person. And I want to thank you for your time.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Gourde, let me ask you this: Are you saying now, you seem like the main emphasis that you were

```
placing was on the drinking and what was going on, is that
 1
 2
    what you are saying was the reason why you are here before
    this Court?
             THE DEFENDANT: No, sir. No, Your Honor.
 4
                                                        The
 5
    drinking wasn't the primary reason. I think you've seen in
6
    the sentencing memorandum that I have a severe sleep disorder.
7
    It's called sleep apnea, and --
8
             THE COURT: Are you saying that between the sleep
9
    apnea and the drinking, that otherwise this wouldn't have
10
    happened? Am I understanding you correctly?
11
             THE DEFENDANT:
                            In all honesty, yes. If I had
12
    actually been sleeping like a normal person sleeps and not
13
    drinking, I never would have allowed myself to get in this
14
    position. Drinking and -- do you know anything about sleep
15
    apnea?
16
             THE COURT: I think I understand it.
17
             THE DEFENDANT:
                             0kay.
                                    Basically I hadn't been
18
    getting REM sleep --
19
             THE COURT: I guess what I am trying to understand,
20
    why would having trouble sleeping send you in one direction?
21
    Why couldn't you maybe just, I don't know, play computer games
22
    all night because you can't sleep?
23
             THE DEFENDANT: I don't understand the position I was
24
    in at that time. I cannot put it into words, because it's a
25
    position that no normal person would have ever been in.
```

Basically, I was at the edge of losing my mind.

THE COURT: I guess what I am trying to understand is, are you saying that there is not a problem here? You just need somebody to, just like the report says, address the sleep problem and drinking problem and everything is fixed? Is that what you are saying?

THE DEFENDANT: As far as myself?

THE COURT: Reflecting on the charge now.

THE DEFENDANT: I am sorry?

THE COURT: Reflecting on the charge as to why you are here and what you are charged with. You are not here because you can't sleep and didn't drink?

THE DEFENDANT: No, Your Honor. As to your comment on everything's fixed, no, everything won't be fixed until you actually pass sentence on me and determine what I need to do to repay my debt.

THE COURT: Maybe you are not understanding exactly what I am saying. This whole thing is indicating a tendency that you were doing and involving yourself in something that you like to do.

THE DEFENDANT: No, I don't believe I was involved in something I like to do.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Moon, let me ask you, anything from what you've heard that would cause you to want to address or alter your report in any way?

PROBATION OFFICER: No, Your Honor. Probation feels the sentence of the low end of the guideline range is the appropriate disposition in the matter.

THE COURT: Anything else to add, counsel?

MR. FIEMAN: No, Your Honor. The only thing I would add on the last point, Micah has been addressing his propensity to look at this stuff with his counselor. I think what he was trying to distinguish is he definitely has problems. That's the reason he's going to counseling every time, two or three times a month to address what was his interest in looking at this stuff.

I think what he was trying to convey to the Court is that what's driving him is not a continuing taste to look at this stuff, but there are other problems which he's addressing in counseling which made him responsible and willing to look at this stuff.

THE COURT: I am looking at the reports that I have.

They all seem to deal with the sleep problem. Is there something that I missed?

MR. FIEMAN: Your Honor, the only thing I put in was a confirmation from his counselor that, just from Northwest Psychological Resources, on their final report confirming that he has been attending this session since June 11, 2002 with Randy Hurst. This is not alcohol treatment. And the sleep disorder treatment is separate also. This is to deal with the

issues and to control his behavior in terms of the specific charges.

THE COURT: But it doesn't say anything --

MR. FIEMAN: Your Honor, his counselor did not want to go further into the nature of the treatment I guess because of his concerns about doctor-patient confidentiality, except I think his assurance about good to excellent progress to show that he's dealing with the issue.

THE COURT: I am asking you those questions for the obvious reason because you are saying somehow the conduct is outside of the heartland, and I am not seeing that.

I understand -- I give him all the credit for trying to get his problem under control and all of that, everything that may contribute to the problem, but in order to say it is outside the heartland, I need something to compare it to and I am not finding that.

The Court, using its discretion, discretion should be sound discretion, not just willy-nilly bring about something, and I am not seeing that.

MR. FIEMAN: I understand, Your Honor. I think the comparison can be made on your own with experience with these cases.

Frankly, I think the strongest argument, and obviously the one that emphasizes this is aberrant behavior in terms of his overall life, and the Ninth Circuit is clear that you look at

```
the totality of the defendant's life, and most importantly,
 1
 2
    Your Honor, I think what is significant --
 3
             THE COURT: You mean as to aberrant behavior?
             MR. FIEMAN: Yes.
 4
 5
             THE COURT: Are you saying -- well, I don't know.
6
    Then walking would be aberrant behavior, I suppose, if you
 7
   just pick out an item what you've been doing, and then doing
8
    it all your life and there is nothing different about the way
    you do it. It seems to me that aberrant behavior has to be
9
10
    something that you totally didn't believe was going to happen
11
    and something that's not continually going on and on and on.
12
    Otherwise, that term wouldn't make much sense, at least to me,
13
    it wouldn't.
14
             MR. FIEMAN:
                          This wasn't continuously going on and
15
    on.
16
             THE COURT: We are talking about a period of time and
17
   we are talking images here. I believe they were talking -- I
18
    don't remember the exact number, but they were numerous, so it
19
    is not like something in one setting.
20
             MR. FIEMAN:
                          Since it is entirely within your
21
   judgment, I am not trying to argue that, but the courts have
22
    been very clear, even something that happened over a period of
23
    a month or two, if it is within the context of the defendant's
24
    life of being an unusual set of incidents.
                                                I think what's
25
    really hard here is the argument I have made for post-offense
```

rehabilitation.

THE COURT: I give him credit for that, trying to do things. Basically, it is an expectation, I suppose, when you are out of jail and you are waiting on sentencing, that you stay out of trouble. Isn't that kind of an expectation?

MR. FIEMAN: With all due respect, it is much more than staying out of trouble involved with what Micah's been doing on his own for the past year.

THE COURT: I understand that, and I see about the sleep matter, but then I see about the last letter that you pointed out, it tells me absolutely nothing.

MR. FIEMAN: It does tell you he has, on his own initiative, got himself into counseling and continued with it.

THE COURT: He's trying to do something about it, and that's good. That's good. But I suppose if you take the position that you are presenting here, without more, everybody that walks in here that's the same presentation.

I am looking for something to give the Court, and I always look for these reasons to say something else should be added to it. You have to give me something to say that that's a legitimate approach or way to go, and I am not finding that here.

I am not finding anything to get us outside the guidelines. I think we are in there. I don't think the facts support it. The discretion should be exercised, but I believe

it should be sound discretion.

MR. FIEMAN: When I state to the Court that I have yet to have a client who has taken the steps that Micah has --

THE COURT: I understand.

MR. FIEMAN: To me, this is not only an exception case but a unique case in my experience. So I am not saying --

THE COURT: I can appreciate all of what you are saying. I am not saying your argument -- I am just saying it's ideal; it's what probation, what everything is all about, to get him back on the right track so he doesn't have this problem again. He says that's the way he's going, and this is what we are talking about is over and above in dealing with that situation.

I am saying then there should be some basis that the Court can say, this is the reason I should do what you are asking this Court to do. I am saying I am not finding that. That's all I can say. I don't want him to stop doing what he's doing. That's what the Court wants him to do. I hope I never see him again under these circumstances. But that's not the issue that the Court is deciding here today, and that's the problem.

So what I am saying is, I see no reason to depart based on these matters that have been stated here. I am just not finding that it is sufficient enough, at least in my

estimation. So I decline to exercise that discretion in doing so.

So the Court will make the finding that the calculations are correct by the probation department. That it would carry an imprisonment range of 21 to 27 months, but I think it should be on the low end of that as has been recommended, so that's where I will place him.

So the sentence will be, Mr. Gourde, that you will -- and I will deal with the other issue that's been raised -- 21 months.

A period of supervision will be three years.

No fine will be imposed under the circumstances of this case, but the special assessment of \$100 will be imposed.

The special conditions to be imposed will be that you cooperate in the collection of DNA by the probation department.

That you not possess any firearm or any other dangerous weapons.

That you submit to mandatory drug testing.

If it is determined by the probation department that you should be involved in a program for the treatment of narcotic addiction, drug dependency, or substance abuse, that you are to enroll in that.

You are to submit to a search of your person, your residence, your vehicle, your property of all kinds to make

sure you are in compliance.

You are to participate in a mental health/sexual offender treatment program, which may include psychosexual evaluations and sexual deviancy programs, those types of things that probation will be working with you in that.

As part of your sexual offender treatment, you are to be involved in group sessions, group therapy. And all of this is left by the therapist to be in charge as to how that will be operated.

You are to submit to a polygraph examination, which would include physiological testing, what they refer to as a plethysmograph, if necessary, to see if they can determine sexual orientation, patterns of sexual arousal and those kinds of things as part of this program.

You are not to have unsupervised contact with minor children under the age of 18 without going through the probation department. I expect them to use common sense with that, when we are talking about members of the family, family reunions and those kind of things. But anything that would give rise to a problem area that may cause them to say you are in violation of your probation, I would ask you if you encounter a situation like that, that you would discuss it first with probation, or at least your attorney, whatever the case, to make sure you do not put yourself in the position of being in violation.

You are not to possess or use any pornographic material of any type.

You are to follow all other lifestyle restrictions, treatment requirements that may be imposed by the therapist as to how you are to conduct your life, avoiding risk of situations that would give rise to these problems, like not residing and going to places where minors are known to frequent and that kind of thing that may give them cause to be concerned.

You are consenting also to them monitoring your computer, your hardware, software, allowing them to make evaluation of your computer use and any matters that may come through your computer. And they will be giving you requirements that they expect you to follow in that.

You also will let them inspect your personal computer that may be owned and operated by you, notify them of any software owned or operated by you, and anything you intend to purchase in terms of software acquisition.

Also provide them, if necessary and requested, financial information, including authorization to make credit checks, see your federal income tax return and that sort of thing.

You are not to incur any substantial new credit without the probation department being advised before the purchase.

The Court, as I have indicated, is making a finding that you do not have to pay a fine, but the special assessment will

1 be imposed. 2 Any other conditions I should be concerned about? 3 MS. FREEMAN: With respect to the forfeiture, I think Your Honor needs to make an oral finding on the record. 4 5 THE COURT: I believe you agreed to that. MR. FIEMAN: That's correct, Your Honor. I have no 6 7 objection to the forfeiture. 8 THE COURT: All right. Then I will sign that. 9 would also sign the judgment as to the sentence in this 10 matter, if you have one prepared. 11 MS. FREEMAN: I did bring one today with me, Your 12 Honor. 13 MR. FIEMAN: Your Honor, just in terms of the 14 sentence, we would just like to note on the record in the 15 sentence that we do request the drug and alcohol treatment 16 I understand it is up to the BOP, but it's sometimes program. 17 helpful to have that as a recommendation in the sentence, just 18 so he continues with his progress in terms of staying off 19 al cohol. 20 THE COURT: I don't see a problem with that. 21 MR. FIEMAN: We will also -- again, it's sometimes 22 helpful to the Bureau of Prisons if we make a request on the 23 record if he is sent to the nearest -- if he qualifies for 24 minimum security, Sheridan, it is not something the Court can

rule on, but sometimes it's helpful if we have the

25

```
1
    recommendations.
 2
             THE COURT: That's fine. The other issue we will
 3
    decide before that is while the appeal is pending --
 4
             MR. FIEMAN:
                          Yes. With regards to the sentence
 5
    imposed, do you want to take up the issue of bail pending
 6
    appeal?
 7
             THE COURT: We will take it up as soon as we sign the
8
    order.
9
        Let me have the government speak to that when you are
10
    through.
11
             MS. FREEMAN: Yes, Your Honor.
12
             THE COURT: Of course, Mr. Gourde, I am sure that
13
    Mr. Fieman has told you now that where you are requesting to
14
    go, it may not be available or open, but the Bureau of Prisons
15
    will determine where you actually end up.
16
             THE DEFENDANT:
                             Okay. Your Honor --
             THE COURT:
17
                         Yes.
18
             (Defendant had discussion off the record with his
19
    attorney.)
                          That's okay, Your Honor, I was able to
20
             MR. FIEMAN:
21
    address the question.
22
             THE COURT: All right.
23
             MR. FIEMAN:
                          Thank you, Your Honor. We've reviewed
24
    the judgment and order, and we have no corrections or
25
    objections.
```

THE COURT: So with the understanding that it comports with the Court's judgment in the matter, I will sign the order of forfeiture as well as the judgment.

This means, Mr. Gourde, this is the sentence that you will be under. If you feel for any reason now that I have imposed an illegal or an unconstitutional sentence upon you, you have a right to appeal this judgment.

Since I have signed it today, if you intend to do that, you need to do it within 10 days of today's date.

All right. The other issue, of course, is whether this defendant should be out pending the appeal. As you recall, it was a conditional plea as I recall. Any issue on that?

MS. FREEMAN: That is correct, Your Honor, it is a conditional plea. I do oppose the motion for bail pending appeal. Title 18, Section 3143, Subsection (b), describes the factors the Court may consider and the findings to be made by the Court in determining whether or not to grant such a request.

As the Court knows, the statute presumes detention after a sentencing pending an appeal by the defendant.

The statute presumes detention unless the judicial officer finds by clear and convincing evidence that -- the factor regarding flight risk and danger to the community, and there must be a finding that the appeal is not for the purpose of delay and raises a substantial question of law or fact likely

to result in reversal or an order for a new trial or a sentence that does not determine imprisonment or a reduced sentence.

Perhaps I am biased, but I don't see that the question of Iaw in this matter is likely to result in reversal or an order for a new sentencing of any kind, so I don't think the defendant can meet the burden under the statute.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. FIEMAN: I don't think the government is seriously contesting the fact that he is not a flight risk and not a risk to the community. That's been argued and certainly he's demonstrated he meets those two factors unless there is some concern about that. He's done exceptionally well with Pretrial Services.

The <u>Montoya</u> case that I cited in my application, the Ninth Circuit very clearly held that all that is required is the movant, the defendant, show that there is a substantial question of law not required to show that they are likely to gain a reversal based on the record that exists at the time the application is made. So that there is a fairly substantial question of law.

Quite frankly, Your Honor, this was a novel and very close question. The Court ruled as it did. Obviously, we respect to that decision, I do frankly intend to vigorously appeal it because whatever ruling the Court made, there were issues that

simply have not been addressed previously.

We rely on Ninth Circuit precedent to try and set up sort of a continuum of what's required, but we are carving out new areas of law with these cases.

The FBI and Customs frankly have been funded and mandated by DOJ to take an aggressive posture toward these cases. We are seeing new types of cases based on new types of warrants all the time.

One issue that has been very clearly mentioned today is the question of downloading. This is not a matter of for purpose of delay, this is a case that's going to the Ninth Circuit. I have not made this request in any other case. I believe it will be vigorously litigated, and I think that's all that we are required to show in regard to the third factor.

The only thing I would add to the side, to the extent the Court has found Mr. Gourde is doing the things that he needs to be doing, in terms of being rehabilitated and complying with what would be required at the other end for supervised release, I really don't see the harm in allowing him to continue doing that for the next six to nine months until we get a decision. He will continue in counseling. He is dealing with the alcohol problem. He has complied fully with Pretrial Services. He's got a good job that he goes to every day.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I just don't see the harm. It is an unusual request because we seldom have an issue of such novel facts regarding computer searches. And it is going to be an interesting appeal one way or the other. So I really hope the Court will grant the motion and allow him to continue doing what he's doing for the next six to nine The sentence is out there for him. months. THE COURT: Let me ask this question: Is he being supervised now for any reasons by Pretrial Services? MR. FIEMAN: Just that it was a condition to his pretrial release. Are you checking in? THE DEFENDANT: I call in every night for a random drug test and --THE COURT: So they do have a condition attached to your release? Mr. Moon, do you have any evidence -- I don't have that before me, but I am not finding -- it doesn't sound like there's any argument here about flight or danger. I don't see He is doing what I -- I am seeing under the circumstances of this case and what I know about this, having handled the suppression hearing, I see no reason not to leave him out under the same conditions he's under now until that issue is finally resolved. MR. FIEMAN: Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: I think that's the fair thing to do in

1 this case. 2 MS. FREEMAN: Thank you very much. In any event, on page 2 of the judgment, if you could, Your Honor, I need you to check the box which says to "surrender for service of 4 sentence", I think it would be appropriate to mark the box as 5 6 designated "by the probation office." 7 Is that how it would work in this case? 8 PROBATION OFFICER: That's correct. 9 THE COURT: Where? 10 MS. FREEMAN: If you look at page 2 on the bottom on 11 the left-hand side, there should be a box which says "The defendant shall surrender for service of sentence." 12 13 THE COURT: Right. 14 MS. FREEMAN: There are three blocks. THE COURT: Right. Okay. 15 16 MS. FREEMAN: I did not mark that earlier because I wanted to wait until we addressed this issue. 17 18 THE COURT: Okay. I would assume that probably 19 either probation or pretrial would be making a notification 20 here, not the Marshals. So I am going to check and give them 21 the obligation to do that. We will know what that is once the 22 Circuit has done their thing. 23 MR. FIEMAN: Thank you, Your Honor. 24 MS. FREEMAN: I am assuming, Your Honor, you are

continuing to order the previous conditions of release.

25

```
THE COURT: Correct, that's what I said, under the
1
2
   same conditions he's under now.
 3
       All right. Anything else?
 4
            MR. FIEMAN: No, thank you, Judge.
            THE COURT: All right. That's the order.
 5
6
            THE CLERK: All rise, court is in recess.
 7
             (Proceedings concluded.)
8
9
                        CERTIFICATE
10
11
       I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from
12
    the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.
13
14
   /S/ Teri Hendrix
                                        March 23, 2006
   Teri Hendrix, Court Reporter
15
                                                Date
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```